REMARKS

[0002]   Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 27-46 are currently pending

- Claims 27, 45, 46 are amended herein

[0003]   Support for the amendments to claims 27, 45 and 46 is found in the specification at least at page 14, lines 3-18.

Claim Objections

[0004]   Claims 28-44 stand objected to as allegedly several informalities noted by the Examiner. Independent claims 27, 45 and 46 have been amended to address the informalities noted by the Examiner.

Cited Documents

[0005]   The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- Benitez: Benitez et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,062,567

- Curtis: Curtis, U.S. Patent No. 6,442,754

- Chen: Chen et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,496,979

- Kouznetsov: Kouznetsov et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,931,546

- Barzilai: Barzilai et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0104015

Claims 27-31, 34, 36-39 and 42-44 Are Non-Obvious Over Benitez in view of Curtis

[0006]   Claims 27-31, 34, 36-39 and 42-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Benitez in view of Curtis. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 27

[0007]   Applicant submits that the Office has not made a prima facie showing that independent claim 27 as amended is obvious in view of the combination of Benitez and Curtis. Applicant submits that the combination of Benitez and Curtis does not teach or suggest the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

> enable the application to be installed on the client computing system, wherein during the enabled installation, the application is available for use while being installed, wherein installation on the client computing system comprises:
>
> receiving a request from the client computing system for a resource;
>
> determining if the requested resource is stored locally on the client computing system;
>
> if the requested resource is not stored locally on the client computing system, determining if the requested resource is an on demand resource or an online resource;
>
> if the requested resource is an on demand resource, caching the requested resource in an application store; [[and]]
>
> **if the resource is an online resource, caching the requested resource in a transient cache and copying the requested resource into the application store**; and

installing the application when a number of resources stored in the application store reaches a threshold number.

[0008]   Claim 27 recites in part, "if the resource is an online resource, caching the requested resource in a transient cache and copying the requested resource in the application store." The Office cites Benitez, Column 10, lines 27-31 as teaching this element. (Office Action, page 6.) Benitez states:

> c. Client Cache Manager 207--This component caches the application bits received from the Application Server 107 so that next time a request is made to the same bits, the request can be served by the cache instead of having to go to the Application Server 107. The Client Cache Manager 207 has a limited amount of space on the disk of the client machine that it uses for the cache. When the space is fully occupied, the Client Cache Manager 207 uses a policy to replace existing portions of the cache. This policy can be something like LRU, FIFO, random etc. The Client Cache Manager 207 is responsible for getting the application bits requested by the Client Streaming File System 212. If it does not have the bits cached, it gets them from the Application Server 107 through the network interface. However it also need to get the "Access token" from the Client License Manager 205 that it needs to send along with the request for the application bits. The Client Cache Manager 207 also updates the Prefetch History Info 209 with the requests it receives from the Client Streaming File System 212.

[0009]   Benitez does not disclose "caching the requested resource into a transient cache and copying the requested resource in the application store" as presently claimed by independent claim 27. Instead, Benitez discloses that when "the space is fully occupied, the Client Cache Manager 207 uses a policy to replace existing portions of

the cache. This policy can be something like LRU, FIFO, random etc." (See Benitez, Column 10, lines 27-48). Benitez teaches that the client cache manager requests application bits through the network interface as necessary. Id. When the limited amount of cache is used up, Benitez discloses elimination of application bits. Id. Benitez is silent as to copying the requested resources cached in the transient cache to the application store.

[0010] Independent claim 27 has also been amended to clarify that the application is installed "when a number of resources stored in the application store reaches a threshold number." This aspect was not previously recited by any claim; accordingly, the Office has not cited any prior art as disclosing, teaching or suggesting this aspect.

[0011] Consequently, the combination of Benitez and Curtis does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claim 28-44

[0012] Claim 28-44 ultimately depends from independent claim 27. As discussed above, claim 27 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, dependent claim 28-44 is also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency on an allowable base claim. Additionally, this claim may also be allowable for the additional features that it recites.

Claim 45 is Non-Obvious Over Benitez in view of Curtis and Chen

[0013]   Claim 45 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Benitez in view of Curtis and Chen. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 45

[0014]   Applicant submits that the Office has not made a prima facie showing that independent claim 45 as amended is obvious in view of the combination of Benitez, Curtis and Chen. Applicant submits that the combination of Benitez, Curtis and Chen does not teach or suggest the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

> enable the application to be installed on the client computing system, wherein during the enabled installation, the application is available for use while being installed, wherein installation on the client computing system comprises:
>
> receiving a request from the client computing system for a resource;
>
> determining if the requested resource is stored locally on the client computing system;
>
> if the requested resource is not stored locally on the client computing system, determining if the requested resource is an on demand resource or an online resource;
>
> if the requested resource is an on demand resource, caching the requested resource in an application store; [[and]]
>
> **if the resource is an online resource, caching the requested resource in a transient cache and copying the requested resource into the application store**; and
>
> **installing the application when a number of resources stored in the application store reaches a threshold number.**

[0015]   Claim 45 recites in part, "if the resource is an online resource, caching the requested resource in a transient cache and copying the requested resource in the application store." The Office cites Benitez, Column 10, lines 27-31 as teaching this element. (Office Action, page 20.) Benitez states:

> c. Client Cache Manager 207--This component caches the application bits received from the Application Server 107 so that next time a request is made to the same bits, the request can be served by the cache instead of having to go to the Application Server 107. The Client Cache Manager 207 has a limited amount of space on the disk of the client machine that it uses for the cache. When the space is fully occupied, the Client Cache Manager 207 uses a policy to replace existing portions of the cache. This policy can be something like LRU, FIFO, random etc. The Client Cache Manager 207 is responsible for getting the application bits requested by the Client Streaming File System 212. If it does not have the bits cached, it gets them from the Application Server 107 through the network interface. However it also need to get the "Access token" from the Client License Manager 205 that it needs to send along with the request for the application bits. The Client Cache Manager 207 also updates the Prefetch History Info 209 with the requests it receives from the Client Streaming File System 212.

[0016]   Benitez does not disclose "caching the requested resource into a transient cache and copying the requested resource in the application store" as presently claimed by independent claim 45.   Instead, Benitez discloses that when "the space is fully occupied, the Client Cache Manager 207 uses a policy to replace existing portions of the cache. This policy can be something like LRU, FIFO, random etc." (See Benitez, Column 10, lines 27-48).   Benitez teaches that the client cache manager requests

Serial No.: 10/692,323
Atty Docket No.: MS1-1800US
Atty/Agent: Jason F. Lindh
-16-
lee&hayes The Business of IP®
www.leehayes.com • 509.324.9256

application bits through the network interface as necessary. Id. When the limited amount of cache is used up, Benitez discloses elimination of the application bits. Id. Benitez is silent as to copying the requested resources cached in the transient cache to the application store.

[0017]   Independent claim 45 has also been amended to clarify that the application is installed "when a number of resources stored in the application store reaches a threshold number." This aspect was not previously recited by any claim; accordingly, the Office has not cited any prior art as disclosing, teaching or suggesting this aspect.

[0018]   Consequently, the combination of Benitez, Curtis and Chen does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Claim 46 Is Non-Obvious Over Benitez in view of Curtis, Kouznetsov and Barzilai

[0019]   Claim 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Benitez in view of Curtis, Kouznetsov and Barzilai. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 46

[0020]   Applicant submits that the Office has not made a prima facie showing that independent claim 46 as amended is obvious in view of the combination of Benitez, Kouznetsov and Barzilai. Applicant submits that the combination of Benitez,

Kouznetsov and Barzilai does not teach or suggest the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

> enable the application to be installed on the client computing system, wherein during the enabled installation, the application is available for use while being installed, wherein installation on the client computing system comprises:
>
> receiving a request from the client computing system for a resource;
>
> determining if the requested resource is stored locally on the client computing system;
>
> if the requested resource is not stored locally on the client computing system, determining if the requested resource is an on demand resource or an online resource;
>
> if the requested resource is an on demand resource, caching the requested resource in an application store; [[and]]
>
> **if the resource is an online resource, caching the requested resource in a transient cache and copying the requested resource into the application store**; and
>
> **installing the application when a number of resources stored in the application store reaches a threshold number**.

[0021]   Claim 46 recites in part, "if the resource is an online resource, caching the requested resource in a transient cache and copying the requested resource in the application store." The Office cites Benitez, Column 10, lines 27-31 as teaching this element. (Office Action, page 24). Benitez states:

> c. Client Cache Manager 207--This component caches the application bits received from the Application Server 107 so that next time a request is made to the same bits, the request can be served by the cache instead of having to go to the Application Server 107. The Client

Cache Manager 207 has a limited amount of space on the disk of the client machine that it uses for the cache. When the space is fully occupied, the Client Cache Manager 207 uses a policy to replace existing portions of the cache. This policy can be something like LRU, FIFO, random etc. The Client Cache Manager 207 is responsible for getting the application bits requested by the Client Streaming File System 212. If it does not have the bits cached, it gets them from the Application Server 107 through the network interface. However it also need to get the "Access token" from the Client License Manager 205 that it needs to send along with the request for the application bits. The Client Cache Manager 207 also updates the Prefetch History Info 209 with the requests it receives from the Client Streaming File System 212.

[0022]   Benitez does not disclose "caching the requested resource into a transient cache and copying the requested resource in the application store" as presently claimed by independent claim 46.   Instead, Benitez discloses that when "the space is fully occupied, the Client Cache Manager 207 uses a policy to replace existing portions of the cache. This policy can be something like LRU, FIFO, random etc." (See Benitez, Column 10, lines 27-48).   Benitez teaches that the client cache manager requests application bits through the network interface as necessary. Id.   When the limited amount of cache is used up, Benitez discloses elimination of the application bits. Id. Benitez is silent as to copying the requested resources cached in the transient cache to the application store.

[0023]   Independent claim 46 has also been amended to clarify that the application is installed "when a number of resources stored in the application store reaches a threshold number." This aspect was not previously recited by any claim; accordingly, the Office has not cited any prior art as disclosing, teaching or suggesting this aspect.

[0024]   Consequently, the combination of Benitez, Kouznetsov and Barzilai does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Conclusion

[0025]   Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Jason F. Lindh Reg. NO. 59,090/   Dated: 2009-07-02
Jason F. Lindh (jason@leehayes.com; 509-944-4715)
Registration No. 59090

Serial No.: 10/692,323   -20-   lee&hayes The Business of IP®
Atty Docket No.: MS1 -1800US
Atty/Agent: Jason F. Lindh
                                                        www.leehayes.com • 509.324.9256